

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/973,263	DEVORE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Maury Audet	<b>Art Unit</b> 1654	

**All Participants:**

(1) Maury Audet. (3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Steve Holmes, Attorney for Applicant. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 15 March 2004

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant  Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:  Yes  No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

#### **Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

NA

Claims discussed:

All.

Prior art documents discussed:

Related pending applications.

#### **Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

#### **Part III.**

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: An Examiner's Amendment to claims 4-6 was proposed to Attorney, which was accepted. Additionally, the Examiner noted that provisional non-statutory obvious-type double-patenting rejections over related co-pending applications 09/973,385 and 09/973,332 were inadvertently omitted in the Office Action of 05/06/2003 . Attorney agreed to Fax Terminal Disclaimers over both pending applications.